body, is but a faint image of this half-death of the twin-being wife and husband. And Rosalia soon felt it in all its agony."

Such passages of just sentiment and beauty are numerous throughout the work. In the delineation of passion, there are scenes awfully terrific: and many exquisite pictures of the most subdued and delicate emotions. Take a single example which combines description, with the pain of a trusting heart, that fears it may have been deceived, and grieves most for the degradation of what it loved:

"It was one of those evenings never to be forgotten by a painter—but one which must come upon him in misery as a gorgeous mockery. The sun was yet up, and resting on the highest peak of a ridge of mountain-shaped clouds, that seemed to make a part of the distance; suddenly he disappeared; and the landscape was overspread with a cold lurid hue; then, as if molten in a furnace, the fictitious mountains began to glow; in a moment more they tumbled asunder; in another he was seen again, piercing their fragments, and darting his shafts to the remotest east, till, reaching the horizon, he appeared to recall them, and with a parting flash, to wrap the whole heavens in flame. * * * Monaldi groaned aloud: 'No, thou art nothing to me now, thou glorious sun—nothing. To me thou art dead, buried—and forever—in *her* darkness; her's, whose own glory once made me to love thee; who clothed me with a brightness even more than thine; who followed me like a spirit, in sleep even, visiting my dreams, as if to fill up the blank of night—to give a continuous splendor to my existence. Oh, idiot, driveller! so to cling to a shadow—a cheat of the senses! What is she to me now? what can she ever be? she that is—that ever was— He could not utter the word. * * * A desolate vacancy now spread over him, and leaning over the bridge, he seemed to lose himself in the deepening gloom of the scene, till the black river, that moved beneath him, appeared almost a part of his mind, and its imageless waters but the visible current of his own dark thoughts."

We will extract but one more passage, and one worthy of the artist. It is a description of an early painting by Monaldi:

"The subject of the picture was the first sacrifice of Noah after the subsiding of the waters; a subject of little promise from an ordinary hand, but of all others perhaps the best suited to exhibit that rare union of intense feeling and lofty imagination which characterized Monaldi. The composition consisted of the patriarch and his family at the altar, which occupied the foreground; a distant view of Mount Ararat, with the ark resting on its peak, and the intermediate vale. These were scanty materials for a picture; but the fulness with which they seemed to distend the spectator's mind, left no room for the thought. There was no dramatic variety in the kneeling father and his kneeling children; they expressed but one sentiment—adoration; and it seemed to go up as with a single voice. This gave the soul which the spectator felt; but it was one that could not have gone forth under common daylight, nor ever have pervaded with such emphatic life other than the shadowy valley, the misty mountain, the mysterious ark—again floating as it were on a sea of clouds—and the lurid, deep-toned sky, dark, yet bright, which spoke to the imagination of a lost and recovered world—once dead, now alive, and pouring out her first song of praise even from under the pall of death."

But the peculiar excellences of this work can in no way be represented by quotations: they lie rather in the completeness and finish of the successive scenes, the easy and natural development of the characters, and the exquisite taste which presides over the whole, and lets off no point with a slovenly execution, and yet suffers no one to swell to undue dimensions.

Cheraw, S. C.

THE RIGHT OF SEARCH.

[It would be sheer affectation in us to disguise the feelings of pride and pleasure with which we lay the following article from the pen of Lieut. M. F. Maury, of the U. S. Navy, before his countrymen—assured as we are, that it will strike the proper chord in every American bosom. We freely confess that, in the simplicity of our heart, we had thought the reasoning of the Earl of Aberdeen, in his correspondence with Mr. Stevenson, on the propriety of a mutual right of search, not only plausible, but almost irresistibly conclusive; and the bland and moderate tone of his Lordship served, in no slight degree, to allay any momentary suspicions that may have flitted athwart our mind; but the film is now removed from our eyes, and, thanks to "Harry Bluff," we have been made to see, clearly, the designs of that all-grasping nation, on whose empire altho' the sun never sets, yet, whose appetite for conquest is no nearer satiety now, nor a whit more squeamish, than when Captain Clive outwitted Omichund by a forged treaty, and placed his puppet Meer Jaffier on the throne of Surajah Dowlah. It is in vain to conceal from ourselves that we are on the verge of a Crisis, and we should accustom ourselves, now, to look it in the face. We should not act the part of the silly ostrich, who, in burying her head in the sands of the desert, vainly supposes she has secured herself from the arrows of her pursuers. We have, it is true, at the head of our department for foreign affairs, a man whose gigantic intellect will favorably compare with that of any man, of any nation; but even he, will not despise such auxiliaries as Gov. Cass and Lieut. Maury. The reputation of the former as a statesman and a diplomatist, is so familiar to his countrymen, that no production of his, however able, can create surprise; but when we see a man scarcely arrived at the age of thirty-five years, the greater part of whose manhood has had its home upon the billow, and whose occupation has been, by no means, especially favorable to profound reflection on matters of national concernment; when we see such a man, enter the amphitheatre of statesmanship, and look proud defiance on the enemies

of "sailor's rights"—we hail the gallant champion of his country's "Star-Spangled Banner," and with him we "nail it to the mast," come weal, come woe! In conclusion, we most respectfully invite the attention of every genuine American, but more especially, of those to whose guardianship are entrusted the national honor and safety, to the lucid and *unanswerable argument* set forth in the following essay.]—*Ed. Sou. Lit. Messenger.*

—

HARRY BLUFF,

ON THE RIGHT OF SEARCH.

1. Correspondence relating to the detention of American vessels on the African coast, by British Armed Cruisers.—Doc. No. 2, H. Rep., 2nd Session, 27th Congress.

2. An examination of the question now in discussion between the American and British Governments concerning the right of search. By an American. Paris, 21st January, 1842.

In 1840–'41, the American Minister, near the Court of St. James, complained to her Britannic Majesty's Government, of the detention, search, and ill-treatment, by her Majesty's armed cruisers, of the American vessels, the Douglass, Iago, Hero, and Mary. The Douglass was boarded in October, 1839; her hatches were broken open, and a prize crew sent on board, who kept possession of her eight days; they consumed her provisions without pay, and so maltreated her crew, that three of them died in consequence. (We take the American statement of the case on the oath of respectable citizens, in preference to the mere assertion of an English Lieutenant, who had to make out a clear case, or lose his commission.) But, notwithstanding the statement of Lieut. Seagram in his own justification, Lord Palmerston admits, that the act of this British officer, in detaining the Douglass, was, *in the abstract*, irregular; yet the *impression* under which he did it, and the *motives* which prompted him to do it, exempt him from any just blame. And that is the satisfaction given by the British government, in this case.

The Iago, also, was detained by Lieut. Seagram, and a watch and chronometer stolen from her by his men. The cargo of the Hero was damaged during her search by the British cruiser, Lynx. The indemnity awarded in these two cases of spoliation, is contained in the expression of a *doubt* by Lord Palmerston, whether "any *wilful* damage was done to the cargo of either of the two vessels in question, by the crews of the detaining ships."

A most flagrant and daring outrage was committed upon the Mary by the British armed cruiser Forester: and, Mr. Stevenson, upon information furnished by an American Consul, prefers a claim for indemnity to the owner of the Mary, and is further authorised by his government to ask for the exemplary punishment of the English Commander, and of those concerned with him in his proceedings against this vessel—proceedings which our Minister pronounced, to "want very little, if any thing, to sink them into an act of open and direct piracy." The judges of the British and Spanish court refused to allow the Mary even to be libelled in their court, on the ground *that the mere fact of her having the American flag hoisted should have protected her from visitation and search by a British cruiser.* And our Minister takes the same grounds, and also insists that her flag should so have protected her, for she was an American vessel. The reparation obtained in this case, is a full justification of the officer, accompanied by pretensions on the part of Great Britain of the most extraordinary, dangerous and alarming character, being nothing more nor less than a proposition to blot out from the law of nations, the most precious rights of neutrality, and to constitute herself the HIGH CONSTABLE OF THE SEAS!

In her graspings after the departing Trident, her Secretary informs the American Envoy,

"That her Majesty's government have *decided*, that the "flag of the United States, shall exempt *no* vessel from "search by her Majesty's cruisers in the African seas, un- "less such vessel shall be *found* provided with papers (and they are to *search* for these of course) entitling her to the "protection of the flag she wears, and *proving* her to be U. "States property, and *navigating the ocean according to law.*"

What law? Why the law *to be enacted*, to be sure, by the *Christian League*; from which France has happily receded, and of which Great Britain is the lion-hearted chief. And who shall be the judge? The noble Lord significantly tells us: *Her Majesty's armed cruisers.* But hear him:

"But this fact cannot be ascertained unless an officer of "the cruiser whose duty it is to ascertain this fact, shall "board the vessel, or unless the master of the merchant- "man shall bring his papers on board the cruiser; and this "examination of papers of merchantmen suspected of be- "ing engaged in the slave trade, even though they may hoist "an United States flag, is a proceeding which it is *abso- "lutely necessary* [the words here and elsewhere are *italicised* by me] that British cruisers employed in the suppres- "sion of the slave trade, should *continue* to practice."

This is the first occasion, in the eventful history of the maritime code, that the right to search the vessels of friends in times of profound peace, has ever been set up by any nation, people or tongue. It is at variance with the uniform practice of every civilized and christian nation in the round world; it is in violation of the principles expressly laid down by all writers upon the international code; and it is directly in the teeth of the expounders themselves of British rights and British law. In the case of a French vessel seized upon the coast of Africa, and brought before the English court of Admiralty, in 1817, Sir William Scott—(Lord Stowell) held this language:

"I can find *no* authority that gives the right of interrup- "tion to the navigation of states upon the high seas, *except* "*that which the right of war gives to belligerents against neu- "trals.* No nation can exercise the right of *visitation* and "search upon the common and unappropriated parts of the "Ocean, except upon the belligerent claim." And still

more emphatic: "No nation has the right to force their "way for the liberation of Africa, by trampling upon the "independence of other States, on the pretence of an emi- "nent good, by means that are unlawful, or to press for- "ward to a great principle by breaking through other great "principles that are in the way."

And our own Kent!

"No nation has a right, in time of peace, to interfere "with, or interrupt, any commerce which is lawful by the "law of nations, and carried on between other indepen- "dent powers!"

In 1839, it was proposed in Parliament to authorise British cruisers to visit, detain, and examine the papers of, American vessels on the high seas. The Duke of Wellington then said in his place:

"The clause in question makes it lawful to detain any "vessels whatever, on suspicion, on the high seas, and de- "mand their papers; and *the persons exercising such author- "ity are moreover indemnified for all the consequences.* Is it "intended that the vessels of any power in Europe may be "searched and afterwards allowed to proceed on their voy- "age, whether we have treaties with those powers or not? "Such a law would be a perfect novelty in the legislation "of this country, and the House ought to well pause before "they adopt it."

And a few weeks after, when this subject came up again, he remarked with great pointedness:

"It is well known that with the U. States we have no "convention; there are indeed engagements made by diplo- "matic notes, but nothing to show the least *disposition* on "*their* part to permit the *right of detention and the search* of "papers; and, if there be *one point more to be avoided than* "*another, it is that relating to the visitation of vessels belonging* "*to the Union.* I warn government not to proceed, but ra- "ther *to issue an order in council, or a declaration of war.*"

Upon this hint, his government proceeded to back herself in quintuple alliance, by the great maritime powers of Europe. She used *great exertions*, it was officially announced, to effect this *Christian* Alliance; and after having succeeded, as she thought, she comes forward with renewed pretensions, and prefers, not in her own behalf indeed, but in the name of this devout 'Christian League,' 'of *the States of Christendom*,'* as Lord Aberdeen loves to style them, this *benevolent* request—a request, which, if granted, would have renewed all the horrors of impressment; and in one month, would have plunged this country in a war with the whole of Europe. We are asked to delegate to an ambitious and grasping people, the right of jurisdiction upon American soil; for in law, the vessels of any nation are a part of her soil. This is a right of the most delicate nature—because of its dangerous tendency;—of its liability to abuse; and of the great interests to be reached through it. For these reasons, it is viewed by all nations with extreme jealousy; so much so, that the sister States of this confederacy dare not trust each other with it. Would an officer of New-York, in the execution of New-York law, be permitted to put so much even as his foot upon Virginia soil? Or would Virginia grant New York the right to send him? The mere attempt of any one of the States, to enforce her laws upon the territory of her neighbor, would lead to the shedding of blood, if not to a dissolution of the Union. Nay, we have seen sister States of this confederacy, actually arrayed in arms against each other for this very cause. Can it be safe then, for these States collectively, to grant to a foreign and rival power, rights and privileges, with which, as individuals, they dare not trust each other? It is not safe to trust others with any of our rights of sovereignty whatever; and, with such a jealous eye have they been regarded in our Republican circle, that even one of the American States cannot of right extend her jurisdiction over the soil of another, upon any pretence whatever. Yet Great Britain demands us to yield to the *arbitrary* exercise of her cruisers, the right, not only to visit and make our *merchantmen*—the *injured party!*—prove that they are Americans, and proceeding *according to law;* but she extends her pretensions still farther, and claims it as to *all vessels;*—by which she includes men-of-war also. I have strangely misconceived the character of American seamen, and the spirit of my brother-officers, if there be one, in the whole Navy, who would quietly brook the visit of a British officer to examine into his character, or tamely submit to have his crew mustered. It would be quite as safe for those on board ship, to allow Midshipmen to sky-lark with fire-brands in the magazine, as it would be for this country, to grant Great Britain this right of *visitation* to American ships on the Ocean. It is a claim that is not lightly set up; and we should *show* to the 'States of Christendom,' that we are not only resolved, but *prepared* to resist it with something more than diplomatic *bulletins.*

These high-handed pretensions were rebuked in the true spirit by our Minister; he met them *in limine*, and opposed them like an American, as he has shown himself to be, upon the true principles. He took the broad grounds, that these United States, so long as they hold sacred, as they ever have done, and, by the grace of God, ever will do—their national honor and the rights of neutrality,—so long as they value their commercial welfare and their maritime rights—and so long as they have a decent respect for the opinions of the world, or any regard for their republican dignity and national independence, never can nor never will submit to such an innovation upon the rights of their citizens. He denied to Great Britain, and to every other pow-

* *States of Christendom.* England, Bavaria, Prussia, Austria, and Russia: these being the only contracting parties to the Quintuple Alliance, the American people will be *pained* to learn that Lord Aberdeen has not only discovered a Shibboleth by which England is to try all vessels that attempt the passage of the seas; but that he has ruled us and all other church-going nations, except the righteous five, out of the pale of Christianity, simply because we will not 'lap with the tongue like a dog.'

er, any right to visit our vessels on the high seas in times of profound peace, or to look behind the American flag for proof of their nationality. He insisted, in effect, that the doctrines of 'free trade and sailors' rights' of which the universal law of nations is the expounder, and Republican America the champion, should not be violated; but, that they should be left undisturbed in those wholesome operations which they had acquired from the last war.

The rejoinders, both of Palmerston and Aberdeen, are in keeping with the designs of their government upon the freedom of the seas. They are of grave import; and convey to the mind, more than meets the eye of casual observers. Here they are; let the reader *reflect* and judge for himself:

"The undersigned is bound in duty frankly to declare to Mr. Stevenson, that to such a doctrine, the British government *never could* or *would subscribe*. The cruisers employed by her Majesty's government for the suppression of the slave trade, *must* ascertain by inspection of papers, the nationality of vessels met with by them, under circumstances which justify a suspicion that such vessels are engaged in slave trade." PALMERSTON.

"But the undersigned must observe, that the present happy concurrence of the *States of Christendom* in this great object, (the suppression of the slave trade,) not merely *justifies*, but renders *indispensable*, the right *now* claimed and exercised by the British government." ABERDEEN.

I am limited in my remarks to space by the Editor, and to time by the Compositor; and have therefore stated as briefly as I well know how, the extraordinary pretensions which have been suddenly started up, and which our Ministers abroad met, and opposed with so much promptness and decision of character.

My Lords Palmerston and Aberdeen broached this new doctrine touching the police of the seas, in a manner, which, for the most part, threw our people at home off their guard. We abandon, say they, the right of *searching* American vessels—after they have *proven* themselves to be such. All that we ask now, is, that you will give us the right to go on board simply to see if the vessel hoisting the American flag, be entitled to wear it—for if you will not allow us to look behind a mere piece of *bunting*, with the American colors and emblems upon it, the American flag will be used by every Pirate and Spanish slaver that sails the Ocean, and by every English vessel of illicit traffic on the water, to protect them from British cruisers. Peaceably surrender to us this right of visitation, and we will assist you to protect your own flag, by preventing its abuse by others.

This appeal was all reasonable enough to many of our honest-hearted citizens; for the manner in which the American flag, in the absence of any armed force, had been abused a few years ago on the coast of Africa, was fresh in the minds of the people; and plain men—at least many of them—considered the denial of this right a kind of abstraction, only a little worse than a practical absurdity. Hence, when this correspondence first appeared, it was wittily remarked that the American Minister had thrown a Parthian dart; and had left, by way of a diplomatic legacy, a wound, which his successor at the Court of St. James, would find difficult of cure. Even the partisan press gave the Minister but a feeble support. His correspondence was assailed in an elaborate article published in the Boston papers, and copied extensively into others, siding with the English view of the question. Very feeble, if any, defence was made; and it was not until Gov. Cass' pamphlet, mentioned at the head of this article, was received, that the eyes of the press and the people were fairly opened to the enormity of the claim set forth. Never was a shaft sped with an aim more truly American. That Ocean-giant claims the right to examine *all*, in order to ascertain what ships are *not* American. Had this right been granted, strangulation, on every sea, awaited our commerce.

The question has been frequently asked,—If we deny to Great Britain the right to look behind our flag, are we not, in effect, protecting the pirates and man-stealers of every nation? for they have only to hoist the American flag, to make sure their escape from British cruisers. With the immunity claimed by our Minister, might not British vessels and British capital, as Lord Aberdeen says, carry on before the eyes of British officers, the detestable slave trade, merely because such vessels should have the audacity to commit an additional offence, by fraudulently usurping the American flag? And would not the stars and stripes be prostituted to all the nefarious practices of the sea?

These apparently are practical difficulties, which have presented themselves to the minds of plain, straight forward men; for such questions have been asked of Navy officers, over and over again.

It is for the purpose of meeting these questions; of satisfying those who ask them, that we have all the right on our side; of shewing the tendency of the British pretensions; and of explaining the practical operation of American principles upon the police of the seas, that I have opened the 'Lucky Bag' again, which as I told you before, is like the witches' cauldron—containing a little of every thing. Moreover, I have myself, used the sea for many years, have sailed the world around, and boarded vessels in all Latitudes; and therefore may claim to speak somewhat from experience.

It is a standing order in the Navy, that our men-of-war shall board no merchantmen except American and those wearing the American flag. This order has been in force since the war; it has been repeated, issued and re-issued over and over again, until it was considered supererogatory to remind officers of it,—having acquired by usage all the force of law. When Commodore Porter, in 1822-'3 was sent out with his Musquito fleet

after pirates in the West Indies, his orders were positive not to go on board any other merchantmen but our own, unless they should hoist the American flag. Now, here was an order, which, according to the English view of this question, would have rendered altogether nugatory the object of the expedition.

But did it so? Far from it. The vessels of the American squadron were as active, and as successful in the detection, pursuit and capture of pirates, as those of any other nation whatever. This order had then, as it has ever had, the very wholesome effect of taxing the ingenuity of officers, in disguising their vessels and concealing their national character from all suspicious looking craft, until the proper moment arrives for making themselves known. Some years ago, the boats of the U. S. S. Cyane, captured a slaver on the coast of Africa. The man-of-war hoisted English—the slaver, American colours *of course*. And our boats actually boarded her under the English flag—nor was she undeceived, until Capt. Stringham announced himself on her decks, as an American officer, and claimed her as his prize. A vessel in which I once sailed, went in search of a pirate that had been depredating between St. Helena and the coast of Africa. As we approached the *suspicious* Latitudes, we discovered a vessel which we took to be a French merchantman; sail was made, and chase given, that we might speak her, thinking perhaps, she could give us some intelligence as to the object of our pursuit. She immediately altered her course, crowded on canvass, and fled with her utmost speed. *This was suspicious.* We spread every sail to the breeze, and continued the chase for many hours—for she was a fast sailer—before we could come up with her. We not only threw a shot over her, but actually ranged up within hail along side of her, and, with lighted matches, pointed to our guns trained upon her, before she would reduce one stitch of canvass. She then hove to for our boat, and hoisted French colors. She proved to be a French vessel of good intent, bound from Bordeaux to the Mauritius; and just before we first discovered her, she had fallen in with a vessel plundered by pirates. The boarding boat was armed; and when the captain and crew were assured of our American character, they leaped for very joy; for in their fright, they had taken us to be the pirate, and as such, they sought to escape us. Here was a case in which the American captain violated the orders of his government, and committed a trespass upon the French flag. But that trespass was a trespass without damage; for it was not considered by the Frenchman as a grievance, and never a word of complaint was heard on the subject.

Vessels of good intent and honest purpose, crossing the track of each other on the Ocean, are like lonely travellers meeting in the desert. They are, for the most part, glad to speak and be spoken. The defenceless merchant trader likes to be assured of safety, and her reckoning;—to learn her Longitude, and perhaps the state of trade and the markets whence her warlike companion comes;—or, it may be, she herself has commercial intelligence of importance for her owners or friends in the country whither the other is bound. The armed cruiser too, has her inquiries to make; and thus the advantages of the interview are reciprocal. If the American Navy officer be remarkable on shore for his gentlemanly bearing and courteous manners—he is much more so at sea; for it is through courtesy only that he visists the foreign merchantman, and obtains from her the information which he desires; and it is through the exercise of this courtesy, instead of '*arbitrary habits*,' that the proper and faithful discharge of his duty frequently depends; and to the credit of merchant captains, I will here say, that I have entered ships commanded by them, of all nations. And in every instance, I have been met at the gangway as the Virginia country gentleman meets the stranger at his door, and been welcomed on board in a manner invariably civil and polite. It is as rare for a Navy officer, who conducts himself properly, to be treated rudely on board the merchantman at sea, as it is for any one, who behaves himself with decency, to be insulted in the private house of a gentleman on shore. I mention this fact, because Lord Palmerston, states in justification of Lieut. Seagram's breaking open the hatches of the American vessel 'Douglass,' that he *was received on board with great incivility!* And well he might be. The London Sun gives the true key as to the cause of this incivility, when it says of the British Navy—"arbitrary habits are engendered in our Naval officers, by the mode employed to procure men for the fleet, and those habits make them treat foreign vessels in an arbitrary manner." This is true to the letter, and borne out by facts. Look at the diplomatic correspondence between the two countries—that on our part is filled with complaints of the insolence and mal-treatment of British officers to American masters and crews. And if the first complaint have ever yet been preferred to our government, of such conduct on the part of an American Navy officer, towards a British vessel or seaman, I have yet to learn of it. And this is not because British vessels are never boarded by American officers. But it is because of this difference of manner. When we board a British vessel at sea, we know we are trespassing—and we are careful not to give offence. We meet an English merchantman on the seas, as you meet your neighbor's carriage on the public highway; he is not in it, and you may stop it, to make inquiries as to the news—whence it comes and whither it goes, perhaps also to warn it of robbers, and to give some other important intelligence, or valuable informa-

tion—and so long as you are courteous and civil, the trespass is not considered as a grievance. But immediately after, some other person comes along, and rudely demands it to be stopped, hauls the driver from the box, orders the footman to open the door and let down the steps, breaks open the packages, presses one of the horses into his own service, and vexatiously detains the carriage for hours on the common highway. This last, is just such a trespasser upon your neighbor's premises, as English officers are upon American merchantmen. Under no pretence and on no account, should we give *such* officers a right to stop our ships. If they do visit, let it be at their own peril, with the warning from us, that we hold them as trespassers, liable at any time to be treated as intruders, and held responsible for damages. We cannot prevent by any physical force, armed British cruisers from boarding one of our defenceless merchantmen, when met alone in the middle of the Ocean; but we can, and do say to their government, we deny your right to do it, and shall hold you as a trespasser if you do. Of course, reason and common sense tell you, that if you trespass upon us without damage, and by consent of master or owner, there will be nothing to complain of, and we shall never be the wiser for it. But, we are afraid to trust you; and on account of the overbearing manners and habits of British officers, we are unwilling to give them, above all others, any right to interfere in any manner whatever, with our peaceful traders—and we give them and you, to understand distinctly, that if they do it upon any pretext or pretence whatsoever, they do it at their and your peril.

The barriers which public opinion and community of interest, throw around the civil magistrate in the exercise of his power, and the safeguards with which the rights of persons and property are hedged about to protect them from the abuse of this power on shore, are all, or nearly all, inoperative at sea. The tendency of power is to abuse, even in the hands of the best men; and no where are the restraints upon it so feeble, as they are upon the master-spirits of armed cruisers out upon the Ocean. If power be entrusted, it is the nature of man to exercise it, in order to display to others his authority—and as it regards the Navy officers of the old world, I recollect a case in point, besides the numerous instances of the just complaints of our merchantmen against them. A messmate was once asked by a Dutch midshipman, "What authority have you American midshipmen over your sailors?" "None but verbal authority." Upon which the Dutchman took up the tiller of his boat and knocked down a sailor. "Why did you do that?" said the other. "To show mine authority," was the reply. The impressment of sailors is a part of the education of British Naval officers; and so sure as we give them any authority whatever over our vessels, just so sure will they display their authority in a summary manner. And though Englishmen *will* sometimes visit our merchantmen, there would be the same difference in their conduct when we deny them, and when we give them, the right, as there would be in the conduct of men generally, under similar circumstances. A and B are two rivals in business. A is disposed to trespass upon B; B warns him, and tells him that he does it at his peril. A therefore acts with great caution and circumspection, and takes care, if he find it *necessary* to trespass now and then, to trespass without damage. But A gets the Legislature to pass a special act, as England sought of the Quintuple Alliance—of the maritime powers of the old world—authorising him to trespass—and how different is the conduct of A, when he enters the premises of B, then! In the proneness of his nature, he breaks down and tramples under foot, without remorse.

But, let us suppose that this right of *visitation* to our vessels in the 'Suspicious Latitudes,' which extend over one half of the Globe, were granted to Great Britain, and that she exercised it in good faith, and granted our merchants indemnity whenever she detained their vessels without cause. What would be the effect? Our trade with Africa is rapidly increasing. And the effect would be this. The summary habits, and arbitrary character of British officers are well understood by our merchantmen, and the mere proclamation that the right of visiting them had been granted to England, would immediately divert a great portion of this flourishing trade into other channels, and the vessels would be laid up. Gov. Cass tells us, on the authority of the Paris journals, that the French vessel 'Sophie,' changed her destination at once, rather than encounter the vexations claimed to be exercised under this treaty, by British officers. What of our commerce that remained, would be driven away by the vexations of visitation and search. Our vessels would be all suspicious, because in the 'Suspicious Latitudes;' they would be visited to-day by the boats of one vessel, and to-morrow by the boats of another, and finally, after they had run the gauntlet, and completed the voyage, the owner would find, that the delays caused by these interruptions, had increased the wages of the crew, swelled the expenses of the voyage, and taken away the best part of his profits. But suppose the voyage to be broken up by the cruisers. Indemnity is uncertain at best, and may require years of negotiation. Delay is equal to ruin; and in a few years from this time, there would not be found an American merchantman any where, from the Gut of Canso to the Bight of Benin.

Lord Aberdeen tells Mr. Stevenson that it has been

"The invariable practice of all Navies in the world, to "ascertain by visit the real nationality of merchant vessels

"met with on the high seas, if there be good reason to ap-
"prehend their national character."

This is true, so far as the American Navy is concerned, only as it regards the *suspicious*, not the national, character of vessels; and it is lamentably true, we all know, of the English Navy. But, so far from pretending to derive this practice from any *right*, except when the vessels prove to be Americans or outlaws, our officers acknowledge it to be merely and entirely the usurpation of the power which *might* gives them upon the Ocean. And, to protect from abuse a power so liable to be misused, the American government, true to her own principles, has hedged it about with all the safeguards that she can set around it: she has thrown the onus of personal responsibility upon her officers whenever they exercise it; thus telling them in fact, that their government is like the common law, regardless of *good intentions*, for, 'it will not hold you quit, if you abuse that *might*, or those powers, or any lawful authority, with which you have been clothed for the public good.'

A few years ago, one of our cruisers in the Pacific, captured a Peruvian man-of-war upon the high seas. Her crew, when last in port, had risen upon their officers; and, after killing or forcing them overboard, had put to sea, as mutineers; they were pirates in will, and only wanted to fall in with a merchantman, to be so in deed. Having it in his power, had he neglected to make a prize of this vessel, the American officer would have been dismissed the service. Or, had he made her his prize, and not been justified by the circumstances of the case in so doing, he would have forfeited his commission, and perhaps his life. When civil authorities direct a *capias* against the person of A; and instead, the sheriff brings into court the dead body of B; it is in vain for him to urge by way of excuse, that he had never seen A, and thought this to be he. He is an *officer*, and the law holds him bound to know the right person—and notwithstanding his *good intentions*, his hands are stained with innocent blood; he is cast into prison as a murderer, to be tried for his life. And justice will not hold him guiltless, for he had been daily taught, both in precept and example, by the benign spirit of the law, that it was better to permit ninety and nine such as guilty A to escape, than that he should have hurt even so much as one hair on the head of innocent B. And so too with the American Navy officer; his government holds him bound to do his duty; but in doing it, he may not invade the rights of others, nor injure the innocent.—And when he does it, it is in vain for him to urge his good intentions. "The way to hell is paved with *good intentions*," says the apophthegm; and if government, or the law would regard these in her officers, except through grace and mercy, some ambitious spirit would soon be found, to rise up and pave the way to war and his country's ruin with what he might choose to term *his* 'good intentions.'

By these means, the U. States has secured from her officers, the exercise of the soundest discretion, as it regards this most delicate matter. In proof of this assertion, I refer to history; for I believe that facts sustain me in the belief, that no claim has ever been preferred by any nation, against this country for indemnity on account of injuries sustained by its merchantmen from an American man-of-war. Hence the practice of the two Navies tells a very different tale; one seldom suspects, and has ever trespassed without damage; when the other doubts—'it takes the trick,' abuses its power, and trespasses without the fear of consequences.

That the stand taken by the United States in this matter, would not, in practice, have the effect of prostituting our flag, as Lord Aberdeen and those who side with him, assert it would, we may appeal to history and actual results. We have set up no new claims as England has done. The maritime rights which we insist shall not be disturbed, we have been in the quiet enjoyment of for thirty years. They are the usages of the sea. Ever since the war, we have denied the right of any nation to visit and search our vessels upon the high seas. Our principles therefore have been tried by thirty years of practice: and, if we except the cases which occurred a few years ago in the absence of any American force whatever on the coast of Africa, we do not find that our flag has been so prostituted as Lord Aberdeen tells us it would be. On the contrary; under the vigilance of our men-of-war, the stars and stripes have been as little used as the cross of St. George, for the shelter and protection of Ocean scape-graces.

But, we are told, England disclaims any right to interfere with our vessels after their papers have been *examined* and they have been *proven* to be *bona fide* Americans; and that she will make good any damages sustained in consequence of her visits. *Timeo Danaos.* We should get such reparation as we received in the case of those vessels about which this correspondence was commenced. As in the case of the Douglass and Mary, though wrong in the *abstract*, there would be something, which, in her eyes, would always justify the detention of *American* vessels, and the interruption of *American* commerce—the motives of her officers in harassing us, would be always *good*, and therefore justifiable. At least so England now tells us in her diplomatic notes; and what would be her language, were the *right* to go on board and examine, given her?

This right, let it be borne in mind, would be exercised by captains, lieutenants and midshipmen. Let us suppose one of the last—a 'Snotty' as he is called in the English Navy, just out of the highland heather of Scotland, or the bogs of Ireland, as the case may be, to be sent to board one of our

merchantmen in the 'Suspicious Latitudes.'—They were boarded and sailors impressed out of them before the last war, by a less responsible person, the coxswain of a boat—He demands her papers, and they are shown; why, says he, these are as easily counterfeited as that bit of striped *bunting* you have hoisted. How do I know that this signature is genuine? This is *very* suspicious. You must open your hatches, and show that your cargo corresponds with your invoice. You must go to your log, calculate the difference of latitude and departure, for every course and distance sailed, for every hour that you have been from port, and project them upon your chart, that I may see whether your track leads back to the place whence you profess to have come. Innocent or guilty, here is a detention, which in nine times out of ten, will break up the voyage; or render trade to that part of the world, a losing business to those who should have the hardihood to undertake it.

Governor Cass analyzes the grounds taken by the English secretaries in support of this new doctrine; and when stripped of the foreign matter with which they are surrounded, he sums them up under three heads:

1st. "Without it, flags may sometimes be abused, and "the guilty escape."

With it, American commerce will be vexed beyond endurance; our vessels will be detained and searched upon the most vague suspicions, and our sailors be impressed and carried away into a worse than African bondage. The humane spirit of the law, the experience of history, and the observation of all good men, agree and teach us that 'it is better that ninety and nine guilty persons should escape, than that one innocent man should suffer.'

2nd. "Without it, English cruisers may sometimes be "prevented from boarding their own vessels, and thus the "municipal laws of England may be violated."

It is almost as impossible for an English built merchantman to pass herself off upon a seaman, as an American, as it would be for a Choctaw chief to pass himself off for an English nobleman. The traders of the two countries are not built after the same fashion, nor sparred by the same rules; and, as there is an indescribable something about men which enables a close observer to tell the citizens of one country from the subjects of another, so there is about ships, some peculiarity of fit, rig, or construction—the mere 'cut of the Jib'—which enables the experienced and well practised eye of the sailor, to distinguish with almost unerring certainty, and from outward appearances, the nationality of merchantmen. And if it be borne in mind, that for the protection of her ship-builders, the laws of England forbid that her subjects should be so much even as part owner of an American built vessel; that under no circumstances whatever, can such a vessel take out English-papers; that her own laws make null and void, the sale of an American vessel to an English subject;—under these circumstances, I repeat, it is difficult to perceive any practical force whatever, in this objection. But if these things were not so, are we bound by any treaty, or any obligation whatever, either written, or implied, to enforce British laws, or to assist her, or her officers in the execution of them! We are asked in effect, to allow British law—all booted and spurred, to ride over our own; and whenever they come in conflict, even within our own jurisdiction, to give it precedence. But on the other hand, when she is requested to restore our property, and to deliver up the servants of our citizens who have murdered their masters, and fled to English soil; her reply is, O no! the English municipal law holds them guiltless and sets them free, for they have done it no violence. Verily this request comes with a good grace to us, from proud and haughty England!

3rd. "Without it, the treaty stipulations for the suppres- "sion of the slave trade, cannot be as well executed."

Guilty ships are governed in their actions by guilty men; and the guilty conscience is just as apt to betray the ship as the man. There is always some little circumstance, difficult indeed to be described, but something in appearance or manner, which directs suspicion to the kidnapper among us, and leads to his detection even as he passes along our public highways. So too, on the highway of nations; the guilty ship is moved by her guilty crew, and whithersoever she is turned, she obeys their guilty spirit. When discovered prowling about the Ocean, the Argus-eyes of the man-of-war, *looking to suspect*, are upon her; so that the actions of the slaver before the cruiser, are even more liable than the conduct of the kidnapper before the officer, to betray and detect. But even if the Great Moral Governor of the Universe had not, in his ways that are past finding out, invested the slaver, as he has other men, with the workings of a guilty conscience, and had not exposed man in his worst character, to the liabilities of self-betrayal, this position would still have no force in it: it is English doctrine and English law, expounded by the high courts of England—and it is the most valuable feature in the conservative principles which guard and protect the international rights of sovereignties—that,

"No nation can exercise the right of visitation and "search upon the common and unappropriated parts of the "Ocean." And that, "No nation has the right to force her "way for the liberation of Africa, by trampling upon the in- "dependence of other States, on the pretence of an emi- "nent good, by means that are unlawful; or to press for- "ward to a great principle, through other great principles "that stand in the way."

Grant Great Britain but the *right* to enter our merchantmen, and her foot is forever upon the neck of this young giant, already her most powerful rival upon the Ocean. Such was her impatient eagerness to effect her purposes, that before her

allies had confirmed the treaty, she proceeded, with indecent haste, to demand our assent to an interpolation upon the law of nations: and this interpolated clause, her ministerial functionary tells us, the happy concurrence of *five* powers, magniloquently termed by him, the STATES OF CHRISTENDOM, not merely *justifies*, but renders *indispensable*. With these threatenings trembling on her lips, she has been suddenly arrested: the scales were removed from the eyes of France, by the hands of a political Ananias sent from us; she saw the dangers in the way, repented, and turned back in good time from the league. And thus the vaulting ambition of England has overleaped itself for once.

It is no new thing for Great Britain to league together with other powers, to interfere with the political affairs of unoffending people, and with whose concerns she has no right, save and except the highway right of her Robin Hood. It is not necessary to go back to remote history, to show that England, as well as other European Monarchies, whenever they have had designs upon friendly nations, have proceeded to effect their purposes by banding themselves together in leagues and alliances.

To show this, we need only recite what has been done within our own times, and to our own knowledge. In 1826, a Turkish province was found in unsuccessful rebellion. She, it is true, had the sympathies of the American people with her, as every people always have, who possess the spirit to be free. But Great Britain leagued herself in triple alliance, and determined that this province should be lopped off as a dependency of the Grand Turk; not because the rights and privileges of the contracting parties were invaded; but because they, in their sovereignty of might, willed it. Accordingly they sent forth their combined squadrons, which burned, sunk and destroyed the whole Turkish fleet. And then, after bandying about among the petty princes of Europe, the new-made Crown of this ancient Republic, they proceeded to put it upon the head of a spluttering German, and to make him the king of classic Greece.

One complete revolution of the seasons has scarcely past and gone, since other Turkish dependencies were found in successful rebellion—and carrying on a revolution which we recognize the right in man everywhere to make. Busy England again forms another league; by virtue of which, and for the settlement of what she calls the *Eastern* Question, she proceeded to batter down the strong hold of the revolutionists, and to dispose of the sovereignty and provinces of a people, with whom she has nothing in common, and of right, as little to do. And now leagued again, she turns upon us with the *Western* question.

We recollect the mystical combination of princes in 'Holy Alliance' against the cause of civil liberty, not joined indeed, but approved of, by Great Britain. By these alliances beyond the black waters, we have not only seen kings set up and fleets destroyed, and people transferred, but we have seen kings pulled down, and nations of that continent blotted out from the map forever.

Nor are we unmindful of the many leagues and alliances, at the head and front of which, Great Britain, in times past, has first placed herself; *when* backed by these, she has proceeded, with a high hand and her strong arm, to inflict upon other nations, private wrongs, and public calamities of the most grievous character. But so long as she confined her designs and the operations of her alliances to European affairs, and crossed not the waters with them, we had nothing to say, and pretended no interference whatever. Once indeed, when the 'Allied Powers' had adjusted the affairs of Europe, and Alexander-like, craved for more worlds to operate upon, they turned their eyes from the old to the new, and had some intent, it was thought, of interfering with the Spanish American States. But the United States at once declared by solemn proclamation to the whole world, that they would consider the interference of any European power, in the affairs of Spain and her American colonies, as a declaration of war against us. Thus the intentions of the 'Allies' were staid, and their operations kept within the bounds of the old world; and we ceased to regard the Triple Alliances and the Quadruple Alliances in which Great Britain chose to unite herself; though we could not forget the terrible struggles to which they gave rise. With the recollection of these fresh upon their minds, it was not without the most serious apprehensions that American diplomatists, in Europe, beheld this great nation strengthening herself in Quintuple Alliance, and then deliberately proceeding, with intent to break down and trample under foot, those time-honored principles of national law, which stand in the way of her designs. There was unfeigned cause of alarm, when she commenced to tell us of a 'Christian league' that she had formed; and of a *new* right of search that was necessary to its purposes. "My course," said she, "is taken: this *right* shall be enforced;" and she added, with a taunt—"It is for the American government alone to determine what may be due to a just regard for their national dignity and national interests."*

Thanks to Governor Cass: France has been induced to hesitate; and we now hope for the best. But for this hesitation, as sure as I write and you read, this most Christian alliance would have made the green sea red. In opposing the unhallowed designs of England, through this League, upon us, it cannot fail to be a source of deep regret and mortification to all good citizens, that we are not in a condition to authorize our Ministers to use the lan-

* Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Stevenson.

guage of prepared resistance. In times like these, much depends upon the mere state of preparation. War and all its horrors may often be averted, simply by being prepared for it. And not being so prepared, invites aggression.

Intelligent Americans need not be reminded of the constant and systematic efforts that have been made for years, by a portion of the English people, to exclude the produce of slave labor from their markets. Had her wary neighbor not been induced to suspect and to falter, the next step of this great Ocean Behemoth, backed by the 'States of Christendom,' would have been to declare, that no ships, laden with slaves, or the fruits of their labor, should sail either within the *Suspicious*,* or any other Latitudes. After this, the next steamer to cross the Atlantic, would have borne us a message from this high priest of the 'Christian League' and Captain of the seas, intimating that a certain domestic institution of ours, stinks in her nostrils—and abolition, prompt and immediate, must be done! Nor was it the intention of its master-spirit, that the coalition should end here. The United States have some naval and commercial pretensions, that are gall and wormwood to her ambitious soul: therefore the wings of our commerce must be clipped. Yankee sailors are brave and hardy, and may be wanted again to fight English battles: therefore a plan must be contrived for getting the right to board American ships. 'Once a subject always a subject,' is British ethics; and the right to impress British seamen *wherever* found, is British municipal law. Therefore said, or thought John Bull, if we can only get the right to enter Brother Jonathan's merchantmen, we have already the right to impress our own seamen wherever we find them—and thus, we will have *secured* to us the old right of impressment, about which the Americans went to war.

Rightly to appreciate these grounds of apprehension, it should be borne in mind, that in 1813 the Executive of England, in his reply to the American manifesto, as to the cause of the war, said, when speaking of the belligerent right of *search* for *contraband*—

"His Royal Highness can never admit that in the exercise of the undoubted and hitherto undisputed right of searching neutral merchant vessels in time of war, (for *contraband only*, such as implements and munitions of war, enemies' troops, etc.); the impressment of British seamen found therein, can be deemed any violation of a neutral flag—or considered by any neutral state, as a hostile measure, or a cause of war."

Here is the express declaration from England, that her officers carry with them wherever they go, this right of impressment. It matters not *how* her officers get on board our merchantmen; being there, they have the right to impress seamen; and 'when they doubt, they take the trick.' This was British doctrine in 1813; let us see what it is in 1842. I quote from the London *Times*, the official organ of the British government. In speaking of the bearings of the Quintuple Treaty, it says:

"This dispute (right of impressment) now sleeps, though it will have to be revived, at latest on the next occasion, when we find ourselves invested, by a war, with the right of which it is the consequence; and indeed it might be *raised upon the contemplated treaty*, giving a mutual right of search for the prevention of the slave trade."

In 1812 the people of these United States decided that they would resist, by force of arms, the impressment of our seamen. And war was declared against Great Britain, not because she *searched* our vessels, but because she stopped them on the high seas, and impressed our people out of them. After England made peace with France, she no longer had need of American sailors, and they were no longer impressed. Consequently, when impressments ceased, the cause of the war ceased. Therefore, Mr. Monroe instructed the American Commissioners not to bring forward at the treaty of Ghent, the subject of impressment at all; for we had resisted it by war when it did exist, and should be prepared so to resist it again, should it ever be revived.

As peace found this vexatious question, so it has remained until renewed by this Quintuple Alliance; or more properly speaking, this league of the maritime powers of the old world against 'sailors' rights,' and the commercial prosperity of the new. In January last, the London Times began to moot it as a corollary, that, as in time of war, they might take from foreign ships the persons of the King's enemies; therefore, they might also, by the same right, take from them the persons of the Queen's subjects. It continues:

"In the practical enforcement, however, of this right or wrong, for on that point it is not *necessary* to pronounce, the searching party, being, from the nature of the case, the strongest, and moreover, ordinarily speaking, persons of *summary habits*, were *apt* to be *somewhat arbitrary* in their judgments as to who was *American* and who was English: 'when they doubted they took the trick,' at least so thought and said the Americans; and any one may remember, that once taken and lodged in an English man-of-war, by right or by wrong, it was not easy to get out of it; and accordingly the American had to stay with just as good a chance of being cut off by a French cannon ball, before he could get his right again, as any of his English fellow sailors."

The Times intimates that the European powers, parties to this treaty, *will not brook to be thwarted.*

"A single war with Great Britain, the (United States) 'has already tried, a war on her part with all Europe will 'be a novelty."

Here then, is a distinct intimation, that this Christian League is armed against the United States. The same view is taken by the Scotsman, another respectable journal, when, in speaking of the real

*'*Suspicious Latitudes.*' A belt of Ocean 5000 miles broad, and more than 10,000 miles long, which was to have extended from South Carolina on the North, and Patagonia on the South, beyond Africa, over half the globe, to the shores of India.

object of the right of search as formerly exercised upon us, it says:

"It was to discover British sailors in American vessels, 'and *practically* give our Naval officers a power to impress 'seamen from the ships of another state." And again—"We have little doubt that the arrogant and indefensible 'right of search, claimed by Great Britain in the last war, 'lies at the bottom of the stubborn hostility of the Ameri-'cans to the reasonable propositions of our government."

"The Americans," says the London Sun, whose remarks are made with much candor, "may very properly 'object to *our* right of search, and may still have a great 'inclination to suppress the slave trade; but of the two 'evils, we have no doubt, but the Americans would prefer 'the eternal existence of the slave trade, to allowing their 'ships to be overhauled by our men-of-war. If they sanc-'tion the examination, for the mere purpose of ascertaining 'if a vessel bearing the American flag is, *bona fide*, an Ame-'rican vessel, they sanction a rigid examination of the vessel 'herself. The papers may be simulated. How is that to 'be proved? By examining the crew, by ascertaining that 'the cargo of the vessel corresponds to the manifest; by 'tracing her route in the Log Book; in short, by subjecting 'her to a complete search. If that be not done, papers 'will at once be produced to correspond to the flag; and 'merely to prove that they do correspond, will be of no use 'whatever. The Americans are well aware of the insults 'and injuries they would submit themselves to, by admit-'ting this claim to visit their ships; and the Morning 'Chronicle does them egregious injustice, when it repre-'sents their resistance to that claim as grounded in *un-'righteousness.*"* And again. "It is *impossible* for the 'Americans to admit this claim. By committing injustice 'on our own people, we have bred up our officers in arbi-'trary habits, which have made them arbitrary to other 'nations; and the consequences debar England from follow-'ing out her humane wishes to suppress the slave trade."

Taking therefore the solemn declarations since made in Parliament by Lord Brougham, in candor and good faith, and admitting Great Britain to be sincere, honest, and single-minded in her purposes—that it is really the suppression of the African slave trade on the coast of Africa, and nothing else that she has in view—here is an *insuperable* objection to our yielding one tittle of our sovereign rights. The overbearing character of her officers is quite as well known to our merchantmen, as it is to English journals. And there is an objection to *our* yielding this right, which does not apply to any other of the contracting parties.—English and American seamen spring from the same stock, and speak the same language; it is easy to mistake one for the other; and when there's any doubt, the English officer, to make sure, 'takes the trick,' and carries him off. Not so with the other powers; their national characteristics are more exclusive, and their seamen speak in a peculiar language, and can never be mistaken, as to their nation. Admitting England to be never so honest in this matter, and that we were willing to trust those who manage her ship of state at home, we could not trust those who manage her ships of war at sea.

The statesmen of England should have recollected, how, in the exercise of this right of search, she had trampled our flag under foot, aggrieved our people, and driven us to war, and they would have known that the American people never would consent to this treaty. Half a century ago, the U. States set their face against the slave trade, and declared it piracy; they were the first among nations, to move its suppression; and to this day, they have striven to put it down. They view it with as much horror as Great Britain herself does—and are prepared to go for the suppression of it as far as they can go, without forcing down those great bulwarks which protect the freedom of the seas, and secure to maritime nations—to the strong and weak alike—the peaceful enjoyment of the rights of commerce. Were the suppression of the *African* slave trade the only object which Great Britain has in view, she might have secured, readily enough, the hearty coöperation of the United States. They would have stipulated to maintain on the coast of Africa, for this purpose, any reasonable force. At short notice, we could have sent there armed brigs and schooners, equal, at least in number, to the cruisers which Great Britain has now employed there. There would have been no objection for one of her cruisers, to accompany each of ours on their cruising grounds. When they made a suspicious sail, they both could join in pursuit, until the chase should show her colours. If they were American, she would be boarded only by our vessel. But should she hoist the flag of any other nation, the American officer would have nothing to do with her; he would leave the Englishman to board, detain, search, and dispose of her as he pleased. It would be no concern of ours. By this arrangement, Lord Aberdeen might dismiss his fears lest British subjects and British capital would usurp the American flag for illicit traffic.

It may be said in reply, grant British cruisers the right to visit vessels under the American flag also, and one-half of this force might be dispensed with, without impairing the efficiency of the whole.

* *Grounded (?) in unrighteousness.* At a meeting of the Loyal National Repeal Association, recently held in Ireland—Mr. O'Connell, who we all know to be rabid on the subject of slavery, said with regard to this question of search, "The Americans unquestionably have a right to resist any search made on their own ships * * *, but why, I will ask, are they so very stringent in their refusal to allow any meddling with vessels sailing under their flag? Oh, England ought to read a lesson from the circumstance. In the last war she acted with the most atrocious barbarity towards American vessels. She trampled their flag under foot—insisted on the right of search—insisted on the right of British subjects to go on board American vessels, and act as they thought proper. England was then in the insolence of her power—she committed the grossest outrages on the rights of the American people; those outrages irritated and provoked them in the highest degree, and that irritation continues to the present hour, (loud cries of hear, hear.) Oh! England ought to recollect that while she had the power—that while it was safe to insult, she did so; but a day of retribution may come" (cheers.)

True it would be *cheaper;* and it would be economical too, if nations could but safely trust their interests to the keeping of each other, and their affairs to the management of their neighbors. If we could with security entrust to the 'Christian Alliance' the safe keeping of our commercial interests, within the 'Suspicious Latitudes'—we might at once recall nine-tenths of our ships—dismantle them, and lay them up to rot. We might say to France, look out for our interests in the Mediterranean—to England, protect our commerce in the East-Indies—to another power, watch for us in the Pacific—and in turn, we will guard and protect, as the apple of our eye, the commercial welfare and prosperity of you all in the West-Indies. If nations were but honest, just, and upright, we need have no Navy at all. But as long as they are not so, each one must look out for its own interests as well in the 'Suspicious Latitudes' and on the coast of Africa, as in the Mediterranean and elsewhere.

The arrangement suggested above would add to, and not impair, the efficiency of the cruisers, both English and American; nor would it have broken thro' any of the great principles which stand in the way to the suppression of the *African* slave trade. It would have been received with acclamation by the great body of the American people. But instead of that, England proceeded to extend within 200 miles of this city, the *suspicious* parallel, and to stretch the borders thereof along the very shores of our Southern States. There is something dark in this, and well calculated to excite suspicion. Had we taken the bait which was held out so alluringly to us, no vessel with slaves on board, could have left the ports of one State for another, or for one of the same State, without being liable to seizure by English cruisers. This much gained, it would have required no latitudinous construction of the treaty itself, to bring within its intent and meaning, the body-servant of every passenger that sails in or out of the Gulf of Mexico.

But to return to the quotations: I have hastily thrown the above together, on some of which Gov. Cass—*there on the spot*, lays great stress; and it is thought not without reason. This is done to show our readers, that there is more in these pretensions than meets the eye; and that G. Britain has not *yet* avowed her real purpose. In the case of the Creole, we are told that we have no just right of complaint, for that our property was taken from us, the murderers of our citizens protected, and our slaves set free, all by the beautiful operations of the benign municipal laws of England. And so, when she gets the right to put her foot on board of our merchantmen, she will impress our seamen and call them subjects, and tell us it was done according to Hoyle and British municipal law—that when we granted her the right to visit, we knew of this law, and therefore its exercise was implied in the grant; and if it were not, we had no right to complain of the operations of her own laws upon her own subjects.

This kind request to visit our merchantmen to keep our flag from being abused, tends really to the ridiculous, and strikingly reminds one of the friendly visit of the Fox to Piggy, in the nursery story. "Open the door." "O no, I'm afraid you'll eat me." "No I wont, just let me get *one foot* in." Having got an entrance for the foot, room was was soon made for the head also; and Piggy was devoured. And so it would be with our sailors if British officers were allowed these *rights of visitation*; though the full-blooded Yankee tar, like the mate in Don Juan, might be rather tough eating, yet the English fleet would receive its recruits from American ships.

How times have changed! A little while ago, and England was as a mother to us; she is now our rival; and has been our foe. So long as she sought to carry out her schemes of aggrandizement, not upon us, and was content to plot her alliances against European Sovereigns and Asiatic Despots, we had not one word to say in the way of protest against her or them. But when, in her dark designs, she attempts to push her plans across the 'great waters;' and, under the *black* flag, preaches up a crusade against the rights of neutrality and American principles, it is high time that the country should be waked up from its slumbers, should examine its arms, and look to its defences.

The relations of the United States both foreign and domestic, were never in a more critical or *ticklish* condition: the monetary concerns of the government and people are deranged—confidence in public institutions and the good faith of bodies corporate, is shaken; the character of the American States abroad has suffered injury; business at home is dull; prospects are gloomy; 'hard times' are at hand; and the minds of men are soured with the reverses of fortune. The damp air grows pestilential, and the still waters of the sea become fetid in the calm, when no strong wind comes to agitate and purify. The storm and the tempest, though frightful in their ravages, are necessary to the well-being of man in the physical world; and, in the moral, revolution and war sometimes become essential for his political independence and welfare. Many are the men who argue that the effects upon this country, of a war now, would be to put in motion the stagnant pools of business, and to order aright, for the public good, the deranged elements of our political economy. The 'Caroline affair' has sunk deep, and yet rankles in the bosom of many a true-hearted American; the public mind in the North, is worn and fretted with the question of the 'Maine Boundary.' 'The Creole case' vexes the South; and the perplexed questions of visitation and search have revived the recollection of former wrongs and animosities.—In

the present feverish and excitable state of the public mind, the agitation of this subject, by pressing it upon us, would excite but one determined feeling throughout the land—there is nothing sectional about it, it is altogether national in its bearings. But touch the American people through their ships and sailors, and, from the St. John's around to the Sabine, from the Atlantic back to the Rocky mountains, there is a war-spirit raised, which it would be difficult to lay. With so many elements at work, both within and without, anxious eyes from all quarters are turned upon the patriots and statesmen of the land; and, while we hope for the best, we are warned by the restive and feverish state of two great nations about to hold a parley, to prepare for the worst.

Six years ago, and a war with England, would have produced a commotion in the political elements of this country, that would have shaken its institutions to their very foundations. Since that, difficulties have arisen, war has been talked of and threatened, until the idea of war has become familiar to the people, and they, in a great measure, have become reconciled to it; and far different would be its effects now. A war at this time would tend mightily to unite us, to strengthen the bonds of the Union, and to brighten the links in the chain which binds us together in brotherhood. And, as before remarked, there are many reflecting men, who think that war now, would be more of a blessing than a curse.

But, I am not given to panic making, nor subject to war fevers. Neither do I think a war necessary or desirable. On the contrary, I should view a war between the United States and Great Britain, as one of the greatest calamities, except a scourge direct from the hand of God, that could befall my country. Doubtless, there are many irritating causes at work in the public mind and feelings on both sides; and so far as any international questions have been raised upon them as *yet*, the right is clearly ours. But to the peaceful settlement of them—a mutual spirit of conciliation and forbearance is of the first importance. There is room, much room for hope in the character of the negotiators concerned; and so long as there is hope, it is wise and brave to indulge it, though it is equally the part of prudence and of wisdom to *fear the worst and to prepare for it*. When nations go to war, *right*, in the day of battle, is more regarded than brute force by a Christian people. We already occupy this tower of strength, and I fear not its surrender—whatever be the *defences* about it which tardy legislation shall fail to provide. In the Navy, there is but one sentiment and one feeling on this subject: it is, avert war, honorably, if you can; if not, let it come: right or wrong, the stars and stripes shall not be disgraced on the Ocean.

HARRY BLUFF.

April 2, 1842.

Notices of New Works.

POPULAR LECTURES ON ETHICS OR MORAL OBLIGATION. *For the use of Schools.* By Margaret Mercer.

We have been surprised upon reading this little volume, to find that it is not in more general circulation, and that it has not excited, in a greater degree, the attention and admiration of the reading public. With regard to this production it appears to us, that admiration would be a necessary consequence of attention—but this is difficult to procure for a book professedly "For the use of Schools." These words suggest to most minds all that is trite and tedious, mingled perhaps, with a feeling of self-gratulation at having passed those days which were necessarily devoted to school-books. It is, unfortunately, not true that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet;" our associations are awakened by names; and words influence opinion and feeling to an almost incredible degree. One would suppose, however, that the use for which this book is specially intended, would at least promote its circulation among the class for whose peculiar benefit it was designed. But here again it is difficult, without some aid or patronage from those versed in the mysteries of the literary trade, to supersede books which are already in use in schools, however defective they may be. There is so much to discourage and depress teachers, so much to reduce their minds to a state almost mechanical, that they are little likely to introduce a new book into use simply from a perception of its merits. They prefer treading the accustomed path, in which their footsteps move almost unconsciously; they generally like best to use those books in which the greatest possible knowledge is crowded into the smallest possible space. The satirical and playful humor of Theodore Hook, has sketched a caricature of fashionable boarding-schools in Mrs. Brandyball's academy, at which we sigh, even while we smile—so much of truth is visible in its exaggerated outlines. For this state of things, we pity rather than blame teachers of such schools: for we believe it to be chiefly attributable to the want of interest felt by parents and guardians generally, on the subject of education; or, perhaps we should rather say, to the little reflection bestowed on it. When parents and guardians are aware, that to be taught to think is one of the first requisites of education—then such books as excite reflection, will be brought into use in schools. The demand only is necessary to create them, or to bring from obscurity those which have already been written.

We think yet another cause exists which has prevented this little volume from obtaining a circulation commensurate with its merits; we mean the total want of all that aid from puffers, which, in our times at least, has unfortunately become necessary to insure literary success. It is not that our age is deficient in literary taste, far from it; but rather that the endless variety of new publications, which are continually issuing from the press, makes it utterly impossible for the most indefatigable reader not to overlook a large portion of these works; and our attention is naturally attracted to those productions, of whose character and merits we have heard something. Some honest chronicler to tell one's merits, seems almost indispensible to obtain even a hearing from the public. We do not profess to belong to the tribe of puffers, and we do not believe that any of the tricks of the literary trade can do more than give an ephemeral existence to books that do not possess real merit; but to declare our admiration of what is excellent, and to endeavor to assist the circulation of a work so well calculated to inform the understanding, to touch the heart, to implant the noblest principles of action, appears to us a debt due to the cause of truth, and a tribute of gratitude due also to the writer, who presents the best fruits of her mind and heart